

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested. After entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-18, 20-22, and 26-33 remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been added.

By way of summary, the Office Action presents the following issues: the Office objected to Claim 30 as containing informalities; Claims 1-7, 22, 26, and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Niitsuma et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publ'n No. 2001/0050782 A1, hereinafter "Niitsuma") in view of Dennis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,471,563, hereinafter "Dennis") and Yoshida (U.S. Patent No. 6,931,432 B1); Claims 8 and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Niitsuma in view of Dennis, Yoshida, and Kuwahara (U.S. Patent No. 6,603,579 B1); Claims 9 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Niitsuma in view of Dennis, Yoshida, and Suzue (U.S. Patent No. 6,618,166 B1); Claims 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Niitsuma in view of Dennis, Yoshida, Suzue, and Toda (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,107 B1); Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Niitsuma in view of Dennis, Yoshida, and Huttenlocher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,905, hereinafter "Huttenlocher"); Claims 15-17, 20-21, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Niitsuma in view of Dennis, Yoshida, and Toda; Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Niitsuma in view of Dennis, Yoshida, Toda, and Huttenlocher; and Claims 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Niitsuma in view of Dennis.

OBJECTION TO CLAIM 30

The Office objected to Claim 30 as containing informalities. Applicants have amended Claim 30 as suggested by Examiner Cheng and therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of the objection to Claim 30.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 22, 26, and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Niitsuma in view of Dennis and Yoshida. In light of the several grounds of rejection on the merits, independent Claims 1, 26, and 30 have been amended to clarify the claimed invention and to thereby more clearly patentably define over the applied references.

Amended Claim 1 recites an image-forming apparatus, including, in part, a format determination part, “the format determination part being further configured to determine the transfer-time format based on a determination as to whether the format of the image data is inversely convertible in the connected apparatus” Applicants respectfully submit that Niitsuma, Dennis, and Yoshida fail to disclose or suggest those features.

Niitsuma concerns an image forming system in which “The digital copier 1 communicates with the apparatus of the transferring point before the image data is transmitted, and the apparatus of the transmission point directs whether the image data is compressed or not, to the digital copier 1 during the communication.”¹ The Office concedes that Niitsuma “*does not specifically teach* [a] format determination part further configured to determine the transfer-time format based on whether the format of the image data is inversely convertible in the connected apparatus,” as previously recited in Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that Niitsuma fails to disclose or suggest the feature of “the format determination part being further configured to determine the transfer-time format based on a determination

¹ Niitsuma, para. [0117].

as to whether the format of the image data is inversely convertible in the connected apparatus,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Dennis concerns a system for resolution reduction. Dennis shows in Figure 4 options selectable by a host-side computer at a time of transmitting data from the host side to the printer side. Specifically, Dennis shows in Figure 4 a balancing of loads by determining whether data are to be compressed and/or converted on the host side or the printer side based on the complexity of the data.

That is, according to Dennis, the data transmission (transfer) format is determined based on the complexity of data.² In Dennis, no determination is made in the connected apparatus, that is, on the printer side, as to whether the format is inversely convertible. The load balancing illustrated in Figure 4 of Dennis is based on an assumption that C, a compression format, or A, an input format on the host side, is convertible by the printer to B, an output format. Dennis neither teaches nor suggests *determining* whether C or A is convertible, not to mention inversely convertible, to B by the printer. Thus, Dennis neither teaches nor suggests “the formation determination part being further configured to determine the transfer-time format based on *a determination as to* whether the format of the image data is inversely convertible in the connected apparatus,” as recited in Claim 1.

Yoshida concerns an apparatus including an “address book [that] includes data representing the features and characteristics of devices connected to the network.”³ The Office apparently acknowledges that Yoshida fails to disclose or suggest the formation determination part previously recited in Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that Yoshida fails to disclose or suggest “the formation determination part being further configured to determine the transfer-time format based on *a determination as to* whether the format of the

² E.g., Dennis, col. 25, ll. 56-58.

³ Yoshida, col. 12, l. 67.

image data is inversely convertible in the connected apparatus,” as recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Niitsuma, Dennis, and Yoshida, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “the format determination part being further configured to determine the transfer-time format based on a determination as to whether the format of the image data is inversely convertible in the connected apparatus,” as recited in amended Claim 1. It is therefore submitted that Claim 1 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over any proper combination of Niitsuma, Dennis, and Yoshida.

It is further submitted that independent Claims 26 and 30 (and all associated dependent claims) are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above with regard to Claim 1 and for the more detailed features presented in those claims.

Dependent Claims 8-18, 20-21, 27-28, and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Niitsuma, Dennis, and Yoshida in various combinations with Kuwahara, Suzue, Toda, and Huttenlocher. It is respectfully submitted that Kuwahara, Suzue, Toda, and Huttenlocher fail to remedy the above-noted deficiencies in Niitsuma, Dennis, and Yoshida. Accordingly, it is further submitted that the rejections of dependent Claims 8-18, 20-21, 27-28, and 31-33 are moot.

CONCLUSION

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the present application, including Claims 1-18, 20-22, and 26-33, is patentably distinguished over the cited art and is in condition for allowance. Such an allowance is respectfully requested at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

Brian R. Epstein
Registration No. 60,329